Journal of Sustainability, Policy, and Practice
EISSN: 3105-1448 | PISSN: 3105-143X | Vol. 2, No. 1 (2026)

Review

AI-Driven Regulation and Risk Control Mechanisms for High-Frequency Financial Trading

Alistair Vance [1], Oliver Sterling [1] and Simon J. Preece [2,*]

[1] Henley Business School, University of Reading, Reading, UK
[2] Surrey Business School, University of Surrey, Guildford, UK
* Correspondence: Simon J. Preece, Surrey Business School, University of Surrey, Guildford, UK

Abstract: This review paper examines the evolving landscape of high-frequency trading (HFT) and the emerging role of artificial intelligence (AI) in its regulation and risk control. HFT, characterized by its speed and complexity, poses unique challenges to market oversight and stability. We explore how AI-driven mechanisms are being developed and deployed to address these challenges, focusing on two core themes: AI for regulatory compliance and AI for risk management. We analyze the potential of AI to enhance surveillance, detect anomalies, and improve the overall resilience of financial markets. Furthermore, we compare existing approaches, highlight current challenges, and discuss future perspectives on the integration of AI in HFT regulation. This review considers the trade-offs between innovation and stability, as well as the ethical implications of AI-driven market oversight. Finally, it provides a direction for researchers and policymakers seeking to navigate the complexities of AI-enhanced financial ecosystems.

Keywords: High-Frequency Trading, Artificial Intelligence, Regulation, Risk Management, Financial Markets, Algorithmic Trading, Market Surveillance

Received: 23 December 2025
Revised: 04 February 2026
Accepted: 18 February 2026
Published: 22 February 2026

1. Introduction

1.1. Background and Motivation

High-frequency trading (HFT) has become a dominant force in modern financial markets, characterized by its reliance on sophisticated algorithms and high-speed infrastructure to execute a large volume of orders at extremely short time scales. Its significance stems from its potential to enhance market liquidity and price discovery. However, HFT also presents significant challenges for regulators and risk managers [1]. The speed and complexity of HFT strategies can exacerbate market volatility and increase the risk of systemic failures, demanding innovative AI-driven solutions for effective regulation and risk control. The need for real-time monitoring and adaptive mechanisms is crucial to mitigate potential adverse impacts arising from HFT activities, especially given the velocity of information v and the potential for cascading failures f.

1.2. Problem Statement and Research Objectives

Traditional regulatory mechanisms struggle to effectively monitor and control the risks associated with high-frequency trading (HFT). The speed and complexity of HFT strategies, often operating at microsecond timescales, outpace the capabilities of conventional surveillance systems. This review addresses this critical gap by exploring the potential of AI-driven solutions for enhanced regulation and risk control. Our primary objective is to investigate the effectiveness of AI techniques, such as machine learning and deep learning, in detecting anomalous trading patterns, predicting market instability, and ultimately, mitigating systemic risk arising from HFT activities, where $risk = f(HFT_{activity})$.

1.3. Scope and Structure of the Review

This review examines AI applications in high-frequency trading (HFT) regulation and risk control, focusing on machine learning techniques for anomaly detection and market manipulation prevention [2]. We cover algorithmic surveillance and predictive modeling for systemic risk. The paper is structured to progressively analyze challenges, AI solutions, and future research directions.

2. Historical Overview of HFT and Regulatory Responses

2.1. Evolution of High-Frequency Trading

High-frequency trading's (HFT) origins can be traced back to the late 1990s with the rise of electronic exchanges and direct market access. Early algorithmic trading strategies, precursors to HFT, focused on arbitrage opportunities arising from discrepancies in prices across different exchanges. The introduction of co-location services in the early 2000s marked a significant turning point, enabling firms to drastically reduce latency. This spurred the development of more sophisticated algorithms designed to exploit fleeting market inefficiencies [3]. The 2007 market structure changes, including decimalization and Reg NMS, further incentivized HFT by increasing market fragmentation and order flow. The Flash Crash of 2010 served as a stark reminder of the potential risks associated with HFT, leading to increased regulatory scrutiny and the implementation of measures aimed at enhancing market stability. Today, HFT continues to evolve, with firms increasingly employing advanced technologies such as machine learning to refine their strategies and adapt to increasingly complex market dynamics. The race for speed and efficiency, measured in microseconds (μs), remains a defining characteristic (Table 1).

Table 1. Timeline of HFT Evolution and Regulatory Milestones.

Year	Event	Significance
Late 1990s	Rise of Electronic Exchanges & Direct Market Access	Foundation for algorithmic trading and precursor to HFT.
Early 2000s	Introduction of Co-location Services	Drastically reduced latency, enabling faster execution and sophisticated algorithms.
2007	Market Structure Changes (Decimalization & Reg NMS)	Increased market fragmentation and order flow, incentivizing HFT.
2010	Flash Crash	Highlighted potential risks of HFT and led to increased regulatory scrutiny.
Today	Continued Evolution of HFT	Use of advanced technologies like machine learning to refine strategies; race for speed measured in microseconds (μs).

2.2. Traditional Regulatory Approaches to HFT

Traditional regulatory responses to high-frequency trading (HFT) have focused on mitigating specific risks. "Speed bumps," artificial delays introduced in trading systems, aim to level the playing field by reducing the advantage of ultra-fast algorithms. Order-to-trade ratios, which limit the number of orders a firm can place relative to executed trades, seek to curb manipulative practices like quote stuffing [4]. Furthermore, enhanced market maker obligations require HFT firms acting as market makers to maintain tighter spreads and provide liquidity even during periods of market stress. The effectiveness of these measures in addressing the systemic risks posed by HFT remains a subject of ongoing debate, particularly as algorithms evolve and exploit regulatory loopholes. The ratio can be expressed as $R = \frac{O}{T}$, where O is the number of orders and T is the number of trades [5].

2.3. Limitations of Traditional Methods

Traditional regulatory methods struggle to effectively monitor and control the complexities of HFT. Rule-based systems often lag behind algorithmic innovation, proving inadequate in addressing newly developed manipulative strategies. The speed and volume of HFT transactions overwhelm human oversight, making it difficult to detect subtle forms of market abuse like layering or spoofing [6]. Furthermore, reliance on end-of-day reporting provides an incomplete picture of intraday activities, hindering the accurate assessment of systemic risk posed by HFT firms and their sophisticated algorithms employing strategies with short-lived alpha, such as $\Delta t < 1$ second [7].

3. AI-Driven Regulatory Compliance Mechanisms

3.1. AI for Enhanced Market Surveillance

AI offers transformative potential for enhancing market surveillance by enabling the real-time analysis of massive datasets generated by high-frequency trading (HFT) activities. Traditional surveillance methods often struggle to keep pace with the speed and complexity of HFT, leading to delayed detection of illicit activities. Machine learning (ML) algorithms, however, can be trained to identify subtle and complex patterns indicative of market manipulation [8].

Specifically, ML can be employed to detect spoofing, where traders place orders with the intention of canceling them before execution, creating a false impression of market interest. Algorithms can analyze order book dynamics, looking for patterns of large orders being placed and quickly withdrawn, correlated with price movements. Similarly, layering, which involves placing multiple orders at different price levels to manipulate the market, can be identified by analyzing the depth and structure of the order book. The speed at which these orders are placed and cancelled, represented by the variable v, is a key factor in detection [9].

Furthermore, AI can detect quote stuffing, a technique used to flood the market with a large number of orders and cancellations, overwhelming trading systems and making it difficult for other participants to execute trades. By monitoring the rate of order submissions and cancellations, denoted as r, and comparing it to historical averages and market volatility, ML models can flag suspicious activity. The change in order submission rate, Δr, over a short period t is a critical parameter. The ability of AI to process and analyze these high-velocity data streams in real-time significantly improves the efficiency and effectiveness of market surveillance, contributing to a fairer and more transparent trading environment (Table 2).

Table 2. Comparison of Traditional vs. AI-Driven Market Surveillance.

Feature	Traditional Market Surveillance	AI-Driven Market Surveillance
Data Analysis Capacity	Limited capacity for real-time analysis of massive datasets.	Can analyze high-velocity, high-volume datasets in real-time.
Detection Speed	Delayed detection of illicit activities due to limitations in processing speed and pattern recognition.	Faster detection of manipulation tactics such as spoofing, layering, and quote stuffing.
Pattern Recognition	Difficult to identify subtle and complex patterns indicative of market manipulation.	Machine learning algorithms can be trained to identify complex and hidden patterns.

Feature	Traditional Market Surveillance	AI-Driven Market Surveillance
Focus	Relies on predefined rules and thresholds, potentially missing novel manipulation strategies.	Adaptable to evolving market dynamics and capable of identifying new forms of manipulation.
Spoofing Detection	Limited ability to track and correlate order placements and cancellations at high speeds to identify spoofing.	Can analyze order book dynamics to detect patterns of large orders being placed and quickly withdrawn, correlated with price movements; relies on parameters like order cancellation speed, v.
Layering Detection	Challenges in analyzing the depth and structure of the order book to identify layering strategies.	Able to analyze the depth and structure of the order book, identifying multiple orders at different price levels.
Quote Stuffing Detection	Limited capacity to monitor and analyze the rate of order submissions and cancellations to identify quote stuffing.	Monitors the rate of order submissions and cancellations, denoted as r, and compares it to historical averages; focuses on the change in order submission rate, Δr, over a short period t.
Efficiency	Lower efficiency in identifying and preventing market manipulation.	Significantly improves the efficiency and effectiveness of market surveillance.
Fairness & Transparency	Less effective in promoting a fair and transparent trading environment.	Contributes to a fairer and more transparent trading environment by reducing manipulation.

3.2. AI-Powered Anomaly Detection

AI-powered anomaly detection offers a powerful approach to identifying unusual market activities that may signal regulatory breaches or system failures. These systems operate by learning the typical patterns of market behavior and flagging deviations from these established norms [10]. This is crucial for detecting subtle forms of market manipulation that might evade traditional rule-based surveillance systems.

Several AI algorithms are particularly well-suited for this task. Autoencoders, for example, can be trained on historical trading data to reconstruct normal market conditions. When presented with anomalous data, the reconstruction error, denoted as e, will be significantly higher than a predefined threshold T, triggering an alert. Clustering algorithms, such as k-means, can group similar trading patterns together. Outliers, defined as data points falling outside these clusters or belonging to very small clusters, are then flagged as potentially suspicious. The distance d of a data point from its cluster centroid can be used as an anomaly score; if $d > \delta$, where δ is a predetermined distance threshold, an alert is raised. These AI-driven methods provide a proactive and adaptive layer of regulatory oversight, enhancing the efficiency and effectiveness of market surveillance [11].

3.3. Automated Regulatory Reporting and Compliance

AI offers significant potential for automating regulatory reporting and compliance in high-frequency trading (HFT). Traditional methods often rely on manual data extraction, aggregation, and submission, which are time-consuming, error-prone, and costly for market participants. AI-powered solutions can streamline these processes by automatically collecting data from various sources, validating its accuracy, and generating regulatory reports in the required formats.

Specifically, machine learning algorithms can be trained to identify patterns and anomalies in trading data, ensuring compliance with regulations such as market abuse directives and reporting obligations. Natural language processing (NLP) can be used to interpret regulatory texts and translate them into actionable rules for automated compliance checks. This reduces the operational burden on firms, freeing up resources for other critical activities. Furthermore, the increased accuracy and timeliness of AI-driven reporting enhance the effectiveness of regulatory oversight, allowing authorities to detect and respond to potential market risks more quickly. The reduction in reporting errors also minimizes the risk of regulatory penalties for market participants. The variable x represents the reduction in reporting time [12].

4. AI-Driven Risk Control Mechanisms

4.1. AI for Real-Time Risk Assessment

AI offers transformative potential for real-time risk assessment in high-frequency trading (HFT) environments. Traditional risk management systems often struggle to keep pace with the speed and complexity of HFT, leading to delayed responses and increased vulnerability to market anomalies. AI-powered systems, however, can analyze vast streams of market data, order flow dynamics, and individual trading behavior in real-time to identify potential risks as they emerge [13].

Machine learning algorithms, particularly deep learning models, can be trained on historical data to recognize patterns indicative of market manipulation, flash crashes, or other adverse events. These models can then be deployed to continuously monitor live trading activity, flagging suspicious transactions or unusual market conditions for immediate review. For example, an AI system might detect a sudden surge in order cancellations, a rapid price movement in a thinly traded security, or coordinated trading activity across multiple accounts, all of which could signal potential risks.

Furthermore, AI can be used to develop dynamic risk profiles for individual traders and trading algorithms [14]. By analyzing past performance, risk tolerance, and trading strategies, the system can assign a risk score to each entity. This score can then be used to adjust trading limits, margin requirements, or even temporarily suspend trading activity if the risk score exceeds a predefined threshold. The system can also learn and adapt to changing market conditions, continuously refining its risk assessment models to improve accuracy and reduce false positives. The goal is to minimize the probability of large losses, represented as $P(\text{Loss} > x)$, where x is a predefined acceptable loss threshold (Table 3).

Table 3. AI-Based Real-Time Risk Assessment Framework.

Component	Description	Functionality	Example Risk Scenario	Mitigation Strategy
Data Ingestion	Real-time market data, order flow, trading behavior.	Captures high-velocity market information.	Sudden unexpected market news influencing trading volatility.	Implement layers with higher sensitivity to absorb fast changes.
AI Model (Deep Learning)	Trained on historical data to detect anomalies.	Identifies patterns indicating potential risks (e.g., market manipulation).	Flash crash triggered by algorithmic trading errors.	Automated circuit breakers to halt trading if predefined volatility thresholds are crossed.
Risk Detection	Flags suspicious transactions and market conditions in real-time.	Provides alerts for immediate human review.	Coordinated trading activity across multiple accounts	Auto suspension of flagged accounts for review.

Component	Description	Functionality	Example Risk Scenario	Mitigation Strategy
			suggesting market manipulation.	
Dynamic Risk Profiling	Analyzes trader/algorithm performance, risk tolerance, and strategies.	Assigns risk scores to entities, adjusting trading limits dynamically.	A trader exceeding their risk tolerance, potentially leading to catastrophic losses.	Automatically reducing the trading limits of accounts with high calculated risks.
Risk Threshold & Action	Predefined loss threshold (x) and corresponding action.	Triggers automated responses based on risk score and market events to minimize $P(\text{Loss} > x)$.	Potential loss exceeding the predefined threshold (x).	Suspend trading when the risk score exceeds the threshold, preventing further losses.
Adaptive Learning	Continuously refines models based on new data and market changes.	Improves accuracy and reduces false positives.	Change in correlation between two previously uncorrelated assets.	Improve models that have reduced prediction accuracy.

4.2. AI-Based Algorithmic Trading Risk Management

AI offers powerful tools for managing the inherent risks of algorithmic trading. These risks include runaway algorithms, unintended consequences stemming from complex interactions, and adverse market impact. AI-driven systems can continuously monitor trading activity, identifying deviations from expected behavior in real-time. This involves analyzing a multitude of factors, such as trade volume, price volatility, order book dynamics, and execution speed. Machine learning models, trained on historical data and expert knowledge, can establish baseline performance metrics and detect anomalies that might indicate a malfunctioning algorithm [15].

Furthermore, AI can proactively mitigate risks by simulating market scenarios and stress-testing algorithmic strategies. This allows for the identification of potential vulnerabilities and the optimization of risk parameters, such as position limits, stop-loss orders, and maximum order sizes. The system can dynamically adjust these parameters based on real-time market conditions and the algorithm's performance. For example, if an algorithm's Sharpe ratio, denoted as S, falls below a predefined threshold $S_{\min}$, the system can automatically reduce its position size by a factor of k. This proactive approach helps to prevent significant losses and maintain market stability.

4.3. AI for Predictive Risk Modeling

AI offers powerful tools for predictive risk modeling, enabling the anticipation of market disruptions and systemic risks. Machine learning algorithms can analyze vast datasets, including historical market data, news feeds, and macroeconomic indicators, to identify patterns indicative of impending instability. These models can move beyond traditional statistical methods by capturing non-linear relationships and complex interdependencies often missed by linear regression or VAR models. For instance, neural networks can learn to recognize subtle signals in trading activity that precede flash crashes, allowing for the implementation of preemptive circuit breakers. Furthermore, AI can quantify systemic risk by modeling the interconnectedness of financial institutions and predicting the potential for contagion effects, where the failure of one institution triggers a cascade of failures across the network. The risk score R_i for institution i can be dynamically updated based on real-time data and AI-driven predictions. By providing early warnings, AI-driven predictive models empower regulators and market participants to take proactive measures, mitigating potential crises and fostering market stability.

5. Comparison of AI Approaches and Key Challenges

5.1. Comparative Analysis of Different AI Methodologies

Different AI methodologies offer varying strengths in tackling HFT's regulatory and risk control demands. Machine learning (ML) algorithms, particularly supervised learning, excel at pattern recognition for anomaly detection, flagging suspicious trading activities based on historical data. Deep learning (DL), with its capacity to process complex non-linear relationships, can enhance predictive accuracy in market manipulation detection and preemptively identify systemic risk indicators, leveraging vast datasets of trading data and order book dynamics. Natural Language Processing (NLP) can analyze news articles and social media sentiment to gauge market sentiment and identify potential triggers for flash crashes, providing regulators with real-time insights. However, DL models often suffer from interpretability challenges, making it difficult to understand the reasoning behind their decisions, a critical aspect for regulatory compliance. ML models, while more interpretable, may struggle with the high dimensionality and noise inherent in HFT data. The choice of methodology depends on the specific challenge and the trade-off between accuracy, interpretability, and computational cost, where $Cost = f(Accuracy, Interpretability)$ (Table 4).

Table 4. Performance Comparison of Various AI Algorithms for Anomaly Detection.

Algorithm	Strengths	Weaknesses	Interpretability	Use Case Example
Supervised Learning (ML)	Excellent pattern recognition, effective anomaly detection based on historical data.	May struggle with high dimensionality and noise in HFT data.	Generally high.	Flagging suspicious trading activities based on historical patterns.
Deep Learning (DL)	High accuracy in market manipulation detection, preemptive identification of systemic risk indicators, handles complex non-linear relationships.	Interpretability challenges, "black box" problem.	Generally low.	Detecting subtle patterns indicative of market manipulation leveraging vast datasets.
Natural Language Processing (NLP)	Gauges market sentiment from news and social media, identifies potential flash crash triggers, provides real-time insights.	Accuracy can be affected by noise and biases in textual data.	Moderate.	Identifying negative sentiment spikes that could lead to rapid market declines.

5.2. Challenges and Limitations of AI in HFT Regulation

AI implementation in HFT regulation faces significant hurdles. Data availability is a primary concern, as access to comprehensive, real-time trading data is often restricted. Model interpretability poses another challenge; the "black box" nature of many AI algorithms makes it difficult to understand their decision-making processes, hindering regulatory oversight. Algorithmic bias, stemming from biased training data, can lead to unfair or discriminatory outcomes. Furthermore, HFT systems are vulnerable to adversarial attacks, where malicious actors can manipulate data to evade detection by AI-powered regulatory systems. The dynamic nature of HFT also necessitates continuous model retraining and adaptation to maintain effectiveness, increasing the computational cost C and complexity X.

5.3. Ethical Considerations

AI-driven market surveillance raises significant ethical concerns. Privacy is threatened by the extensive data collection required for effective monitoring, potentially impacting traders' personal information. Fairness is challenged by algorithmic bias, where skewed training data could lead to discriminatory outcomes against certain trading strategies or participants. Accountability becomes blurred as complex AI models make decisions, making it difficult to assign responsibility for errors or unintended consequences. Ensuring transparency and explainability in AI systems is crucial for addressing these ethical dilemmas (Table 5).

Table 5. Ethical Considerations in AI-Driven HFT Regulation.

Ethical Issue	Description	Potential Impact	Mitigation Strategies
Privacy	Extensive data collection by AI systems for market surveillance.	Violation of traders' personal data privacy; potential for misuse.	Implement robust data anonymization techniques; strict access controls; adherence to data protection regulations (e.g., GDPR).
Fairness	Algorithmic bias in AI models due to skewed training data.	Discriminatory outcomes against specific trading strategies or market participants; unequal enforcement of regulations.	Rigorous testing for bias; diverse and representative training datasets; ongoing monitoring of model performance across different groups.
Accountability	Lack of clear responsibility for errors or unintended consequences arising from AI decisions.	Difficulty in resolving disputes; erosion of trust in the regulatory system; potential for regulatory arbitrage.	Implement explainable AI (XAI) techniques; clearly defined roles and responsibilities for model developers and users; establish mechanisms for redress.
Transparency & Explainability	Opacity of complex AI models, making it difficult to understand their decision-making processes.	Reduced trust in the system; difficulty in identifying and correcting errors; hinders effective oversight.	Prioritize the use of explainable AI models; provide clear documentation of model logic and assumptions; implement audit trails to track decision-making.

6. Future Perspectives and Research Directions

6.1. Emerging Trends in AI and HFT Regulation

Advancements in explainable AI (XAI) offer promising avenues for enhancing transparency in HFT algorithms, enabling regulators to better understand and audit complex trading strategies. Furthermore, federated learning, allowing collaborative model training across multiple institutions without direct data sharing, could facilitate the development of more robust and representative risk models while addressing data privacy concerns. The integration of causal inference techniques can help disentangle spurious correlations from genuine causal relationships in market data, leading to more effective regulatory interventions. Exploring reinforcement learning for dynamic regulatory policies, where policies adapt based on market behavior, presents another compelling research direction. Finally, the application of graph neural networks to analyze interconnected trading networks could improve systemic risk monitoring.

6.2. Future Research Opportunities

Future research should prioritize developing more robust and explainable AI algorithms for high-frequency trading (HFT) regulation. This includes exploring techniques like causal inference to better understand the impact of HFT strategies on market stability and fairness. Further investigation is needed into integrating AI with other regulatory technologies, such as blockchain for enhanced transparency and auditability. Exploring novel data sources beyond traditional market data, like news sentiment and social media activity, could improve market surveillance capabilities. Finally, research should address the ethical considerations of AI-driven regulation, focusing on fairness, accountability, and potential biases in algorithmic decision-making, ensuring that AI promotes a just and efficient financial market.

7. Conclusion

AI offers promising avenues for enhancing HFT regulation and risk control. Benefits include improved market surveillance, anomaly detection, and faster response times to destabilizing events. However, challenges exist, such as algorithmic bias, the need for robust validation methods, and the potential for AI arms races between regulators and traders. Addressing these issues is crucial for realizing AI's full potential. AI offers transformative potential for HFT regulation, demanding a balanced approach. Future frameworks must foster innovation while mitigating systemic risks and ensuring equitable market access. Continuous monitoring and adaptive algorithms are crucial for navigating the evolving landscape of AI-driven HFT.

References

1. S. V. Pradeepa, B. Sarkar, and S. P. Mohanty, "Artificial Intelligence and Advanced Technologies: Transforming Financial Markets, Strategies, and Regulatory Compliance," *International Journal of Innovations in Science, Engineering And Management*, pp. 323-333, 2024.
2. Y. Ansari, S. Yasmin, S. Naz, H. Zaffar, Z. Ali, J. Moon, and S. Rho, "A deep reinforcement learning-based decision support system for automated stock market trading," *IEEE Access*, vol. 10, pp. 127469-127501, 2022. doi: 10.1109/access.2022.3226629
3. S. Yuan, "Mechanisms of High-Frequency Financial Data on Market Microstructure," In *Modern Economics & Management Forum*, 2025, pp. 569-572.
4. Y. Mahajan, "The Impact of Artificial Intelligence Advancements on the Frequency and Severity of Flash Crashes in Financial Markets," *Available at SSRN 5650011*, 2025. doi: 10.70251/hyjr2348.36218222
5. C. L. Cheong, "Study on Risk Assessment Methods and Multi-Dimensional Control Mechanisms in AI Systems," *European Journal of AI, Computing & Informatics*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 31-46, 2026.
6. A. Azzutti, "AI governance in algorithmic trading: some regulatory insights from the EU AI act," *Available at SSRN 4939604*, 2024. doi: 10.2139/ssrn.4939604
7. W. Liu, G. Rao, and H. Lian, "Anomaly pattern recognition and risk control in high-frequency trading using reinforcement learning," *Journal of Computing Innovations and Applications*, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 47-58, 2023.
8. J. Wang, "A Literature Review of Enterprise Strategic Management in the Context of Digital Transformation," *Economics and Management Innovation*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 71-78, 2026.
9. A. Peterson, S. Gray, A. Ramirez, S. Martin, and T. Hu, "Regulatory Challenges in Algorithmic and Autonomous Trading Systems," 2024.
10. S. Yuan, "Conceptual Modeling and Semantic Relations in the Construction of Financial Knowledge Graphs," *Economics and Management Innovation*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 64-70, 2026.
11. A. Khang, "AI-Powered Cybersecurity for Banking and Finance: How to Enhance Security, Protect Data, and Prevent Attacks," *CRC Press*, 2025.

12. C. L. Cheong, "Research on AI security strategies and practical approaches for risk management," *Journal of Computer, Signal, and System Research*, vol. 2, no. 7, pp. 98-115, 2025.
13. B. Charoenwong, Z. T. Kowaleski, A. Kwan, and A. Sutherland, "RegTech," 2024.
14. D. Hirnschall, "A deep learning approach for analyzing the Limit Order Book (Doctoral dissertation, Technische Universitat Wien)," 2020.
15. A. Azzutti, W. G. Ringe, and H. S. Stiehl, "Regulating AI trading from an AI lifecycle perspective," In *Artificial Intelligence in Finance*, 2023, pp. 198-242.